

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,253		09/17/2003	Nancy Kathryn Tedeschi	NT0002	3733
37008	7590	06/16/2005		EXAMINER	
		ENTING, INC.	HONG, JOHN C		
1187 HILLSIDE AVE, APT. 3B28 NISKAYUNA, NY 12309				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			3726	
				DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u> </u>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/664,253	TEDESCHI, NANCY KATHRYN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John C. Hong	3726				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the provision of the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period from the period for reply will, by statution and the period for reply will, by statution of the period for reply will be peri	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct at 1) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examir	cepted or b) objected to by the le e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1,2,4-8,10-12are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Piesker (U.S. Patent 2979089).

Piesker discloses; Regarding Claims 1,2,4-7, an apparatus for fastening an earring, the apparatus comprising: a motor adapted for generating a torque, and an earring back holder (11) adapted for applying the torque to an earring back (4); the earring back holder is removable (col.3, line 24); the motor is electrically operated; the motor is spring (20) operated; further comprising a clutch (12) adapted for limiting the torque; the motor is reversible (19) (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 10-69);

Regarding Claim(s) 8,10-12, an apparatus for fastening an earring, the apparatus

Art Unit: 3726

comprising: a motor adapted for generating a torque; and an earring back holder adapted for applying the torque to an earring back, the earring back holder being removable, the motor being electrically operated; the motor is spring operated; further comprising a clutch adapted for limiting the torque.

It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piesker (U.S. Patent 2979089).

Piesker teaches teach the limitation except the earring back holder is magnetized.

But Official Notice is taken that magnetizing holder part is well known in the art and It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to magnetize the holder part of Piesker so as to easily locate the metal parts.

6. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Piesker (U.S. Patent 2979089).

AAPA in the specification page 1, teaches the method of fastening earring back manually, but failed to teach the method of generating a torque using a motor which is

Art Unit: 3726

electrically operated, spring operated and applying torque to an earring back using an earring back holder which is removable and limiting the torque using a clutch.

Piesker teaches the method of generating a torque using a motor which is electrically operated, spring operated and applying torque to an earring back using an earring back holder which is removable and limiting the torque using a clutch (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 10-69)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the method of Piesker on the method of AAPA so as to easily fasten the earring back without losing it.

Regarding Claim 15, the limitation of the earring back holder is magnetized, Official Notice is taken that magnetizing holder part is well known in the art and It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to magnetize the holder part of Piesker so as to easily locate the metal parts.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John C. Hong whose telephone number is 571-272-4529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(07:00-16:30)First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3726

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John C. Hong Primary Examiner Art Unit 3726

jh June 12, 2005